

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Nathaniel A. Singletary,)	Case No. 9:24-cv-03132-JDA-MHC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>OPINION AND ORDER</u>
)	
Brian P. Stirling, <i>SCDC Director</i> ;)	
Jana Hollis, <i>Deputy Warden</i> ; Stephen)	
Ayers, <i>Sgt.</i> ; Hilary Moore, <i>QMHP</i> ; Rod)	
Rowe, <i>MHO</i> ; Sgt. Roosevelt Anderson;)	
Lieutenant Charles Frazier; Ofc. K.)	
Williams, <i>a/k/a</i> K. Will; Captain Parker,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the Court on a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the Magistrate Judge. [Doc. 13.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter is referred to United States Magistrate Judge Molly H. Cherry for pre-trial proceedings.

Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint was entered on the docket on May 20, 2024, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. [Doc. 1.] On September 26, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Defendants Brian P. Stirling, Ofc. K. Williams, and Captain Parker be summarily dismissed from the action because the Complaint fails to provide any specific facts to support a claim that these Defendants violated Plaintiff’s federal constitutional or statutory rights. [Doc. 13.] The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. [*Id.* at 6.] Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, Defendants Stirling, Williams, and Parker are summarily DISMISSED from this action without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin
United States District Judge

November 22, 2024
Greenville, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.